

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 were pending in this application. Claim 17 has been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Hence, claims 1-18 remain pending. Reconsideration of the subject application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 5,353,327 to Adari, *et al.* (hereinafter "Adari").

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 16 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adari, in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 6,904,130 to Urban, *et al.* (hereinafter "Urban").

Claims 5-6 and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adari in view of Urban, and further in view of Applicant admitted prior art.

Claim 17 has been amended to more particularly recite the Applicant's claimed invention.

The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims 1-18, because the office action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

(MPEP § 2143) Here, the office action has not met all three criteria. Specifically, the office action has not shown that the prior art teaches or suggests all the claim limitations, the suggested motivation fails to motivate one to combine the references, and there is no expectation of success.

For example, claim 17, as amended, includes "disconnecting one of a plurality of inside wiring from the connection interface." The cited references do not teach or suggest this limitation. Each MTU of Adari includes a connection to a single telephone line and a connection

to a single inside wiring. Urban teaches a plurality of telephone lines, but says nothing of a plurality of inside wirings. Hence, neither cited reference teaches a plurality of inside wirings, and claim 17 is believed to be allowable for this reason.

Further, there exists no motivation to combine the references. The MTUs of Adari work on 1-to-1 relationships between telephone lines and inside wirings. Each inside wiring/telephone line combination uses a separate MTU (See, Fig. 1), and the office action correctly points out that Adari does not teach an interface operable for connecting a plurality of inside wirings. Urban is directed to solving a different problem that has nothing to do with a plurality of inside wirings. Urban relates to a plurality of telephone lines, not inside wirings. Hence, in light of this difference in technology, one would not be motivated to combine the two to achieve the Applicant's claimed invention, and claim 17 is believed to be allowable for this additional reason.

Moreover, there is no reasonable expectation of success. The plurality of telephone lines taught by Urban, if connected to the MTU of Adari would result in a system in which the dial tones of many incoming telephone lines provide dial tone signals to the MTU. IN other words, if a customer were trying to locate the source of a deal line (one having no dial tone), the MTU would be ineffective since any of a number of incoming telephone line dial tones would register a signal on the indicator. The customer would still have no idea which of the incoming telephone lines having an absence of a dial tone signal would be causing the customer's line to be dead. Hence, the combination would not work, and claim 17 is believed to be allowable for this additional reason.

Independent claims 1, 16, and 18 include similar limitations and are believed to be allowable for similar reasons. The remaining claims depend from one of these independent claims and are also believed to be allowable, at least for the same reasons.

Appl. No. 10/672,819
Amdt. dated October 19, 2005
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2643

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'IEB', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Irvin E. Branch
Reg. No. 42,358

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
IEB:arl
60589961 v1